

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 4-15 are now pending in the above-referenced application and are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration. Applicants note that claim 3 was canceled in the previous response of March 29, 2006.

The Examiner cited a new document and changed his opinion that the present Application includes allowable substance. The new cited document of Minamiura et al. (US 2002/0000787 A1) describes a method for charging battery packs in a hybrid vehicle having a plurality of battery units. In this context, it is proposed to optimize the charging in such a way that charging is performed using two different charging methods. In the first charging method, charging is performed using a large electric current. This charging takes place until the pressure in a battery cell, measured with the aid of a sensor, rises to a limiting value. After that, charging is performed using a lower current, in order to prevent a further pressure increase.

In addition, it is provided, and is described in paragraph 0037 that is cited by the Examiner, that, at a charge state of 100%, in a third charging method (or discharging method) a discharge of the battery is undertaken, in order to lower the pressure. How this discharging is undertaken is not described in the cited document.

However, from this place in the text, the Examiner concludes that a deactivation of the charging device, that is, a deactivation takes place of the generator used for the battery charging. However, this is not described at any place in the cited document. It is only stated that a discharge is undertaken.

The cited document of Minamiura does not show the claimed invention, either alone or in combination with the other references on which the Examiner relies, because of the following differences:

In Minamiura et al., charging is performed using different currents, and in the claimed method, in the first charging method, regulation is performed to a constant voltage.

In Minamiura et al., different charging methods are used to reduce the pressure, their selection taking place as a function of the measured pressure. In the claimed invention, in the second charging method, a dynamization is achieved (for instance, a better mixing through of the battery acid), and the two charging methods are selected independently of the pressure, that is, the pressure is not measured at all.

Finally, in the claimed invention, in the second charging method, a discharge is undertaken by switching in a user or by a de-excitation of a charging device, that is, of the generator, whereas in Minamiura et al. it is not stated at all how the discharging is undertaken after the maximum charge is attained.

The combination of the teachings of the documents of Koo and Minamiura et al. do not yield the design approach claimed by us without any problem, since, though it is true

that in both cited documents two different charging methods are mentioned for battery charging, this is not done in order to implement the advantages achievable by our design approach.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

By: LS Reg. No. 41,122

Dated: 11/17/06

By: [Signature]

Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 22,490

One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200
(212) 425-5288